

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Patent Application of)

Yasushi Yamade)

Application No.: 09/910,282)

Filed: July 19, 2001)

For: METHOD FOR INSTALLING A)
PRINTER DRIVER AND)
COMPUTER-READABLE MEDIUM)
STORING INSTALLATION)
PROGRAM)

Group Art Unit: 2126

Examiner: DIEM K. CAO

Confirmation No.: 2056

REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated January 9, 2006, Applicant requests a pre-appeal brief conference. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 4, 11, 13, 19, 23, 31 and 32 being independent.

An object of the present invention is to avoid errors created by the user selecting an incorrect driver or setup information, i.e., a driver with the wrong regional information. Claims 1, 4, 11, 13, 19, 23, 31 and 32 have the specific step of "referring regional information set in the computer terminal in advance". That information is preset in the computer terminal and referred to so as to enable the claimed method to select a driver, or other setup information, based on the preset regional information so that a user does not inadvertently select the driver or setup information with incorrect regional information.

Dodson in view of Harding:

The examiner relies upon Dodson for teaching most of the claimed subject matter except for, among other elements, "referring regional information set in the computer terminal in advance". The examiner alleges that the element is taught by *Harding* at col. 6, lines 39-41, and col. 13, lines 5-10. At that section, *Harding* describes that "The ULM program prompts the end user with a choice of operating languages and corresponding language keyboard configurations in various languages on the screen" (col. 6 lines 39-41), and "The software setup program prompts the end user, in various foreign languages including English, to select the desired language of the operating system and graphical user interface. The software setup program also prompts the end user to select a language keyboard configuration." (col. 13 lines 5-10)

As emphasized with underlines, *Harding* discloses that the program prompts the *user* to select (choose) a language. On the other hand, an object of the present invention is to avoid errors created by the user selecting an incorrect driver or setup information, i.e., a driver with the wrong regional information. To implement this object, in the present invention, the regional information is set in the computer terminal *in advance*. As a result, the regional information is not set or selected by the user.

Harding clearly does not teach or suggest a system wherein regional information is set in a computer terminal in advance so that the preset regional information can be used as the basis for selecting one of multiple drivers stored on a recording medium. Harding teaches that the user must select the program without

the benefit of regional information being preset. Thus, Harding cannot overcome the deficiency of the Dodson reference.

The present invention prevents the user from the burden of selecting and installing a proper printer driver or other setup information that is suitable for the particular region where the printer is used. Since the user has no burden to select regional information when the user installs the printer driver, the user never installs a wrong printer driver accidentally.

Contrary to the present invention, *Harding* requires the user to select a suitable language. If the user selects a wrong language accidentally, the wrong software is installed. Thus, the user has to select the language carefully. Since the teachings described in col. 6, lines 39-41, and col. 13, lines 5-10, in *Harding* require the user to select a suitable language, the teachings are different from the particular step of the present invention, and in fact teach away from the concept of the present invention which is to avoid having the user make such a selection.

Accordingly, *Harding* does not disclose the aforementioned particular claim element of claims 1, 4, 11, 13, 19, 23, 31 and 32 in spite of the examiner's allegation.

Harding in view of Dodson:

In the rejection using Harding in view of Dodson, the examiner also relies on Harding for the alleged teaching of "referring regional information set in the computer terminal in advance". However, as set forth above, that reliance is incorrect. Accordingly, the rejection using Harding in view of Dodson is also in error and should be withdrawn.

Garney and Hanson:

The examiner has rejected some dependent claims using Garney and Hanson as tertiary references. However, neither Garney nor Hanson overcomes the deficiency discussed above.

Conclusion:

For at least the reasons set forth above, the rejections of Claims 1, 4, 11, 13, 19, 23, 31 and 32 are deficient and should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-18, 20-22, 24-30 depend from Claims 1, 4, 11, 13, 19, 23, 31 and 32 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons and also because they define features that additionally define over the cited documents.


In view of the foregoing information, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all the outstanding rejections of the claims.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this pre appeal brief, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
(INCLUDING ATTORNEYS FROM BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS)

Date: April 10, 2006

By: Henri B. McGoff (Rn. 53,217)
 William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620